

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed April 14, 2009 (hereinafter "Final Action"), claims 1, 6, 7, 10-12, 21-23, 27, 31, 36, 53, 55, 57, and 63 have been amended, and claims 2, 13, 32, 37, 43-49, 51-52, 54, and 58-62 have been cancelled. No claims have been newly added. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification (e.g., FIGs. 4 and 5 of the as-filed application along with the associated description). Thus, no new matter has been added. Therefore, claims 1, 3-12, 14-31, 33-36, 38-42, 53, 55-57, and 63 are pending.

In view of the foregoing amendment and the following reasons, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 63 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the means". The foregoing amendment of claim 63 renders this rejection moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 63 under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph is earnestly solicited.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13, 16-27, 30-34, 36-41, 43, 45-47, 49, 51-53, and 55-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0078424 to Yairi *et al.* ("Yairi") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0019645 to Goodman *et al.* ("Goodman"). [Final Action, pg. 2]. Applicant disagrees with the propriety of this rejection. However, solely in an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 21, and 36 solely to provide a clearer presentation of the claimed subject matter. It appears that the Examiner has inadvertently omitted citing claims 54 and 58-63 as also being rejected over Yairi in view of Goodman on pg. 2 of the Final Action. However, Applicant has assumed that the Examiner intended to do so as stated in pgs. 11-13 of the Final Action.

The rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and must be withdrawn at least because Yairi and Goodman, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest, all the features of the claimed invention.

For example, Independent claim 1 recites “a system for facilitating the exchange of data between a web service and one or more instant messaging clients, comprising”, among others, the features of “the processor configured to: generate *linking information that links the user command to a corresponding web service command format* associated with the web service, and the processor further configured to: receive, *after* the linking information is generated and stored in the database, *the user command for a second time together with one or more parameters to be included in a web service command associated with the web service*, and generate the web service command including the one or more parameters and corresponding to the user command in the web service command format based on the stored linking information.”

According to an aspect of the invention, when a user command (e.g., “temp” in FIG. 5 of as-filed Specification) in an instant messaging message is received for a first time, linking information that links the user command to a corresponding web service command format associated with a web service is generated and stored in a database. Thereafter, the user command is received for a second time together with one or more parameters (e.g., “ltemp 02451” in FIG. 5 of as-filed Specification) that are to be included in a web service command associated with the web service. When the user command is received for the second time, the stored linking information is utilized to generate a web service command including the one or more parameters and corresponding to the user command in the web service command format.

Yairi, however, fails to disclose linking information that links a user command in an instant messaging message to a corresponding web service command format associated with a web service being generated. Paragraph 27 of Yairi teaches that any data needed for the interaction between end user and a requested web service is stored in the database. However, ~~there is no mention of storing linking information that links a user command in an instant~~ messaging message to a corresponding web service command format associated with a web service. Also, Yairi fails to disclose that this stored linking information is utilized to generate a

web service command corresponding to the user command in the web service command format.

Further, in Yairi, an IM client (and hence the user) is constantly prompted for the required input until all the input parameters for the web service message have been received. On the other hand, such prompting is not required according to an aspect of the claimed invention, because the user command is received together with the parameters to be included in a web service command. Since a user may know the parameters that are needed for the web service command, such parameters may be provided together with the user command to efficiently generate/process the web service command for the web service.

Goodman fails to cure the deficiencies of Yairi identified above. Goodman relates to publishing electronic messages through a pub/sub service to subscribing clients and fails to disclose, teach or suggest the foregoing features of the claimed invention. Neither does the Examiner allege that Goodman discloses these features.

For *at least* the foregoing reasons, the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yairi in view of Goodman is improper and should be withdrawn. Moreover, because independent claims 21 and 36 recite similar patentable features as claim 1, claims 21 and 36 are also patentable for at least the same reasons presented relative to claim 1. Dependent claims 3-12, 16-20, 22-27, 30-31, 33-34, 36, 38-41, 53, 55-57, and 63 are allowable because they depend from one of allowable independent claims 1, 21, and 36, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Claims 14-15, 28-29, 35, 42, 44 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yairi in view of Goodman and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0105884 to Upton ("Upton"). Applicant disagrees with the propriety of these rejections for at least the reason that claims 14-15, 28-29, 35, and 42 are allowable because they depend from allowable independent claims 1, 21 and 36, as well as for the additional features they recite.

~~Further, Upton fails to cure the deficiencies of Yairi and Goodman. For example, the Examiner relies upon Upton as allegedly teaching a web service associated with an enterprise or~~

legacy system. However, Upton fails to disclose, teach or suggest, at least the features discussed above relative to claim 1.

For *at least* the foregoing reasons, the rejection of dependents claims 14-15, 28-29, 35, 42, 44 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yairi in view of Goodman and further in view of Upton is improper and should be withdrawn. Various ones of these claims may include other separately patentable features, but because the base rejection is deficient, these arguments need not be addressed at this time.

Conclusion

All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant's representative remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

/Nidhi Chotani/

Nidhi Chotani
Reg. No. 59,924
Tel. No. 703.770.7900
Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: July 14, 2009
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102